

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated February 22, 2005 and mailed February 28, 2005. In that Office Action, the Examiner stated that the claims of the pending application were drawn to two separate inventions. The Examiner indicated that Claims 1-17 were drawn to an apparatus, and Claims 18-20 were drawn to a method. The Examiner stated that the inventions were distinct because the process can be done without a pilot valve assembly.

In the current paper, Applicant has amended Claim 18 to include a pilot valve assembly. As Claims 19-20 are dependent on Claim 18, this amendment is also applicable to these claims. Applicant submits that the process of Claims 18-20 cannot be practiced by another materially different apparatus. In view of the amendment, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the restriction and examine Claims 1-20 of the present application.

If the Examiner does not withdraw the restriction, Applicant elects Claims 1-17 drawn to an apparatus.

SUMMARY

Applicant has amended Claim 18. In view of this amendment, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the restriction. If the Examiner does not withdraw the restriction, Applicant elects Claims 1-17. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorneys for the Applicant via telephone if such communication would expedite this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Adam D. Airhart
Registration No. 51,387
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200